



**Indiana's Three-Year
Delinquency Prevention &
Systems Improvement Plan
Plan Update & Application**

FY 2007 Update



INDIANA CRIMINAL JUSTICE INSTITUTE

One North Capitol Avenue, Suite 1000 • Indianapolis, IN 46204

317/232-1233 Phone • 317/232-4979 Fax

Michael W. Cunegin, II, Executive Director

Mary L. Murdock, Chief Operations Officer

Tanya E. Johnson, Youth Division Director/Juvenile Justice Specialist

Robert Mardis, Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group Chair

BUILDING SAFE COMMUNITIES

Every day in Indiana, individuals struggle to keep themselves and their loved ones free from harm...

In our neighborhoods, home, communities, workplaces, on the roads and in our schools, safety is one issue that affects us all. When public safety is breached and harm comes to individuals, both victims and perpetrators enter a complex legal framework of agencies, advocates and interests constructed with the hope that *justice will prevail*.

Guided by a Board of Trustees representing all components of Indiana's criminal and juvenile justice systems, the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute serves as the state's planning agency for criminal justice, juvenile justice, traffic safety, and victim services. The Institute develops long-range strategies for the effective administration of Indiana's criminal and juvenile justice systems and administers federal and state funds to carry out these strategies.

Improving Juvenile Justice & Promoting Positive Youth Development

Hoosiers under the age of 18 occupy a special place within the State's justice system. Not yet adults, they are cast into a world which often requires maturity beyond their years. Because Indiana's juvenile offenders and at-risk youth have special needs, problems and concerns, the Institute's Youth Division works to improve the juvenile justice system and support projects that prevent and/or reduce juvenile crime while promoting positive youth development through community collaboration.

ICJI BOARD OF TRUSTEES

John von Arx, Chairman	Policy Director for Public Safety Governor's Office
Susan Carpenter	State Public Defender
Steve Carter	Attorney General's Office
David Donahue	Commissioner, Department of Correction
Richard Good	Citizen/retired
Steve Johnson	ED of IN Prosecuting Attorneys Council
Eric Koch	IN State Representative (R)-Bedford
Larry Landis	ED Public Defenders Council
Mgr. Tom Melville	Proxy-Indiana State Police
Abe Navarro	Deputy Floyd County Prosecutor
Russell Ricks	Chief of Police
Jane Seigel	ED of IN Judicial Center
Matt Strittmatter	Sheriff, Wayne County
Jeff Schrink	Citizen/ISU
Mark Stuaan	Partner, Barnes and Thornburg LLP
Leann Weissmann	Judicial Referee, Dearborn Superior Court

Indiana OJJDP Formula Grant Program

FY 2007 Three Year Plan Update

Description of System

(No Change)

Analysis of Juvenile Crime Problems and Juvenile Justice Needs

ANALYSIS OF JUVENILE CRIME PROBLEMS

(No change)

PROBLEM STATEMENTS

Introduction

Based on the Prioritized Problem Statements provided in the 2006 comprehensive three year plan (Table 1), a working group consisting of JJSAG representatives; the state's Juvenile Justice Specialist; Indiana's Compliance Monitor and the research Director of the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute; met to refine the prior year's 2006 selected Purpose Areas that determines funding for the Title II Formula Grant Program. As advised by OJJDP's State Representative for Indiana, the aforementioned working group narrowed down the list of fifteen (15) purpose areas to nine (9) purpose areas (including planning and administration and the JJSAG allocation) to more efficiently focus the identified problems surrounding youth development, delinquency and the juvenile justice system in Indiana. The following purpose areas have been combined to reflect a narrowed approach. A percentage of the state's award will be used for the respective purpose area to fund subgrantee programs.

1. Planning and Administration- 10% of award
2. JJSAG allocation- 2% of award
3. Mental Health (combined Purpose Areas: Community Assessment Centers, Substance Abuse, Mental Health)- 20% of award
4. Delinquency Prevention (combined PA: School Programs & Delinquency Prevention)- 20% of award
5. Compliance Monitoring (combined PA: Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders & Compliance Monitoring)- 15% of award
6. Minority Overrepresentation- 10% of award
7. Graduated Sanctions (combined PA: Probation, Court Services, Graduated Sanction)- 10% of award
8. Juvenile Justice System Improvement- 7% of award
9. Gender Relevant Programming- 6% of award

To accommodate subgrantees and operate grant cycles and award processes in an efficient manner, consideration is being made to change grant cycle timelines which include the before and after stages of granting awards through the designated state agency (ICJI). This will allow JJSAG members ample time to review grant applications and make preparations for awarding grants prior to the start of the grant cycle.

Table 1
Prioritized Problem Statements

<i>Rank</i>	<i>PROBLEM STATEMENT NARRATIVE</i>	
1	Lack of comprehensive mental health services for both at-risk juveniles and juveniles already within the juvenile justice system. There is a growing recognition that many youth are entering the juvenile justice system with co-occurring disorders (mental health & substance abuse) that have been unrecognized and misunderstood. The extent and nature of this problem varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Further, the problem is exacerbated by a lack of available statewide data with regards to the mental health needs of youth and the array of services available in jurisdictions to address those needs once identified. In smaller, rural areas the problem may be one of lack of services, while the larger areas may face a lack of service coordination leading to youth “falling through the cracks”. There is a need to continue developing and fostering linkages between mental health, substance abuse, educational, and criminal justice systems. There is funding available through other federal funding streams to meet these needs, but this may be an area that requires coordination in order to address the unmet mental health needs of juveniles entering the state’s juvenile justice system.	
2	Decreasing levels of funding for primary prevention efforts to fund sound, research-based prevention programming. Specifically funding to support mentoring efforts, character education/morals/values-based programming, life-skills, and faith-based programming. There continues to be a need to focus on positive youth development through the development of healthy communities that provide youth with the support and positive structure necessary to thrive and be successful.	
3	Statewide jail removal and alternatives to secure detention efforts successfully brought the state into compliance with JJDP Act. These efforts must continue to be supported through funds, training, technical assistance and compliance monitoring activities. The continued compliance monitoring and public education efforts regarding the proper handling of juvenile offenders and non-offenders must continue to be a high priority for the Criminal Justice Institute. The occurrence of violations in specific areas (deinstitutionalization of status offenders) and facilities reveals that continuing with targeted rather than widespread compliance monitoring efforts is the best strategy.	
4	Further research is needed to determine the extent of overrepresentation of minority youth at each point of the justice system, as well as the factors that contribute to overrepresentation. There are a number of underlying factors that can lead to an overrepresentation of minority youth in the justice system. Interestingly, less than 5% of criminal justice professionals surveyed around the State “strongly agreed” that minority juveniles are overrepresented in arrests, charging, waivers, and secure pre- and/or post-trial detention. This reveals a need for in-depth research into the issue, as well as public education regarding the issue of minority overrepresentation and the factors that contribute to higher levels of minority involvement within Indiana’s justice system.	

5	Lack of resources for sound researched-based intervention programs in the areas of aftercare, juvenile probation and both non-secure and secure juvenile programs/facilities. Specifically, programming to address cognitive-behavioral based approaches, mental health needs, life skills, work-force development, graduated sanctions, etc., within the justice system and youth-serving agencies should be emphasized. (Should be noted that resources in these areas have increased with the implementation of JAIBG that is designed to address such programming needs.)	
6	There continues to be a need for training and technical assistance statewide for juvenile justice professionals and key community stakeholders in order to provide expertise and cutting edge information to improve the level and quality of services being provided to youth. This includes training in the areas of community collaboration, cultural diversity, child/adolescent development, positive youth development, interagency communication/ coordination, fiscal management, and program evaluation (process & outcome). Cross-training in the areas of mental health, substance abuse, education, and child welfare systems is needed as well.	
7	National and State data reveal that female offenders are increasingly involved with the justice system for more serious offenses. Further research reveals that gender-specific programming is necessary for young, at-risk females and delinquent females. The availability and level of gender-specific programming Statewide is currently in the early stages of research. The Criminal Justice Institute should continue to support the importance of developing and implementing gender-specific programming, while promoting information-sharing regarding successful programs focused on at-risk and delinquent females across the State.	
8	Continued need to support the development of comprehensive juvenile justice information systems to coordinate service delivery at the local level and to promote comprehensive data collection for planning and policymaking purposes. It should be noted that JABG does provide funding in this area on a local level, but that funds, whether through Formula or JABG, to coordinate local information systems may be necessary.	

Plan for Compliance with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act

REMOVAL OF STATUS OFFENDERS AND NONOFFENDERS FROM SECURE DETENTION AND CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES¹

Indiana's 2005 – 2006 Compliance Monitoring Report revealed that the State has remained in substantial compliance with the deinstitutionalization mandate of the JJDP Act. Our efforts to provide intensive training and technical assistance to detention centers, law enforcement, probation and judges around the state have continued to reap the benefits of reduced violations.

There has been great improvement in universe identification, classification, data collection and verification, while at the same time, compliance with the DSO requirement remains steady. In July 2006, a web-based reporting system was initiated. All juvenile detention facilities, all juvenile Department of Correction facilities, approximately 95% of adult lockups, and approximately 85% of adult jails are reporting detention data. The Youth Law T.E.A.M. of Indiana (YLT), the ICJI Contracted Compliance Monitor, continues to bring additional facilities on line with the web-based reporting system. The initiation of the web-based system has greatly increased the accuracy of the self-reported data; has resulted in more "real-time" access to data, resulting in the ability to more effectively and efficiently address compliance issues. The YLT is currently undertaking an initiative that will have all adult jails reporting detention data by June 2007.

The Youth Division of the Institute will continue targeted efforts at providing training and technical assistance, through the YLT, to jurisdictions reporting violations of the JJDP Act core requirements. The YLT will continue to conduct regular site visits, as well as provide on-site technical assistance to facilities and communities experiencing compliance issues. These efforts have led to substantial changes in the handling of juvenile offenders at the local level. At the same time, staff of the YLT are working to further enhance our training efforts by improving both the training curriculum and expanding the audiences targeted to receive training.

During fiscal year 2006, the Youth Division began to coordinate with the Indiana Association of Residential Child Caring Agencies (IARCCA) in order to begin the process of bringing the residential facilities into the compliance monitoring universe. The YLT, in collaboration with IARCCA, conducted three (3) regional trainings with residential facilities to ensure that they are aware of both state law and the core requirements of the JJDP Act as they pertain to residential facilities, and to provide the opportunity to receive further technical assistance. Initiating all required compliance monitoring tasks with the residential facilities has been identified as a top priority for fiscal year 2007.

Finally, provide for in the written compliance monitoring Policies and Procedures, adopted in July 2006 and updated January 2007, the Compliance Monitor will send a letter to each facility found to be in violation with any part of the JJDP Act, with copies of the letter going to each chief probation officer and judge with juvenile jurisdiction within the county. The letter will detail incidents of non-compliance and will offer the jurisdiction assistance in eliminating violations within the facility and may request a written response regarding violations and the plan to eliminate these incidents. For facilities with a high number of violations (over 10) or

¹ This section contains excerpts from the *Indiana Criminal Justice Institute, 2004 State Monitoring Report*.
Indiana Criminal Justice Institute
OJJDP Formula Grants Program
Three Year Plan Update 2007

those whose plan to eliminate violations is not satisfactory, the Compliance Monitor will request a meeting with the relevant agencies within the jurisdiction to discuss options for bringing the jurisdiction into compliance. If all attempts to bring the jurisdiction back into compliance fail, the State will exercise the right to file a writ of habeas corpus through the State Public Defender's Office.

PLAN FOR SEPARATION OF JUVENILES AND INCARCERATED ADULTS

Based on Indiana's 2005 – 2006 Compliance Monitoring Report, Indiana is in full compliance with the sight and sound separation mandate of the JJDP Act. It is extremely important, in light of the high rate of detention and jail construction across the State, to maintain an adequate strategy to prevent future violations of this federal requirement. Compliance monitoring will continue to include on-site visits to verify and determine in the case of new facilities, that sight/sound separation is continuing to be upheld. The Compliance Monitor will continue to work collaboratively with the Jail Monitor of IDOC to share information regarding compliance with the sight/sound separation mandate.

There are several barriers that need to be overcome in order for Indiana to maintain compliance with the sight/sound separation mandate in the future. First, local officials must continue to be convinced that alternatives to secure detention, such as nonsecure holdovers with attendant care, are more appropriate alternatives than adult jails and lock-ups. Second, Indiana needs to insure that there are adequate detention resources for the children who are actually appropriate for secure detention. In some areas, county officials may feel that they have no other alternative available to them other than to securely detain the juvenile in an adult jail or lock-up.

The first barrier can be overcome by utilizing resources that are available through the Criminal Justice Institute and Department of Correction. Every county in Indiana now has access to alternatives to detention through these agencies. Special efforts will be made to work with those counties that are still detaining juveniles in adult jails and lock-ups. Training and technical assistance will be provided through subgrants to the YLT. The second barrier is being overcome by facilitating relationships between counties that have juvenile detention centers and counties that have a need for occasional detention but do not have the resources to build a center in the county. Agreements between these counties allow non-detention center counties to have certain access to juvenile detention beds when needed. Finally, the Youth Division of the Institute has forged a partnership with the Indiana Association of Residential Child Caring Agencies (IARCCA). These facilities report that they are often not at full capacity and that they are often overlooked as a viable alternative to secure detention. The Youth Division in partnership with IARCCA and YLT will continue to promote the use of viable alternatives to secure detention such as the residential agencies that are currently members of IARCCA.

PLAN FOR REMOVAL OF JUVENILES FROM ADULT JAILS AND LOCKUPS

Based on Indiana's 2005 – 2006 Compliance Monitoring Report, Indiana is in substantial compliance with the jail removal mandate. The Youth Division of ICJI, through the YLT, has continued to provide training and technical assistance to jurisdictions, resulting in improved data reporting, as well as some changes in local policies to ensure that status offenders are not

held securely and that crime-delinquent youth are not held for more than six (6) hours upon arrest. Unfortunately, improving the accuracy of reporting is more quickly achieved than changing the practices and policies at the local level. As such, we have continued to experience an unfortunate artifact of increased training and improved reporting that has only just begun to be reversed as local policies are changing.

ICJI will continue our targeted efforts at providing training and technical assistance to jurisdictions reporting high levels of violations. These efforts have led to substantial changes in the handling of juvenile offenders at the local level. Our training and technical assistance will now be further enhanced by the collaborative efforts of the ICJI and the YLT. The YLT will continue to conduct regular on site visits as well as provide on site technical assistance to facilities that have a high number of violations. At the same time, staff of the YLT are working to further enhance our training efforts improving both the training curriculum and expanding the audiences targeted to receive training. Currently the YLT is working closely with the Indiana Sheriff's Association and Indiana Judicial Center to include JJDP Act training in the training curriculum for newly elected Sheriffs and Judges.

(1) Six-hour hold exception

Indiana law is consistent with the jail removal mandate in that crime-delinquent youth may be held for up to six hours upon arrest in a secure setting within an adult jail or lockup for the purposes of identification, processing, interrogation, release or transfer to a juvenile detention facility. During this time, sight and sound separation must be maintained.

Indiana law does not provide the six-hour hold exception before and after court appearances.

(2) Rural removal exception

Indiana does not utilize the rural removal exception.

(3) Transfer or waiver exception

Indiana law does provide that juveniles under adult court jurisdiction may be held in adult facilities. This provision allows such holding for any offense for which a juvenile may be under adult court jurisdiction. Indiana law does have several instances where juveniles, age 16 or older, may be under adult court jurisdiction for misdemeanor offenses (i.e. carrying a handgun without a license, misdemeanor traffic offenses). This creates a conflict between Indiana law and the JJDP Act that significantly impacts Indiana's ability to maintain compliance with the jail removal mandate.

Legislation was introduced to bring Indiana law into compliance with the JJDP Act during the 2007; however, it did not pass. The JJSAG will continue to advocate for passage of such legislation.

As aforementioned, pursuant to current policy and practice in Indiana, juveniles under adult court jurisdiction are not housed in juvenile facilities. Adherence to this policy and practice will be monitored through the usual course of compliance monitoring. If it is discovered that such juveniles are being held in juvenile facilities, training and technical assistance will be provided to ensure that such juveniles are removed prior to six months after they turn 18.

PLAN FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT

Indiana's Compliance Monitoring function is funded through a Title II grant awarded to the Youth Law T.E.A.M. of Indiana. Several key components of the Compliance Monitoring Program were initiated in 2006, which will continue Indiana's improvement toward an adequate system of compliance monitoring.

In 2006, the JJSAG adopted Indiana's Compliance Monitoring Policy and Procedure Manual which outlines Indiana's Compliance Monitoring Program. Attached is the Compliance Monitoring Timetable which addresses: *Universe Identification and Classification; Facility Inspection; and Data Collection and Verification*. Also, in 2006, Indiana implemented a web-based reporting system and as of July 1, 2006, all juvenile detention facilities (and many county jails and local police departments) were reporting detention data via the web-based system. The implementation of the web-based reporting system has resulted in more accurate information, as well as more timely information, which will result in the ability of the Compliance Monitor to identify and address potential compliance issues in a more timely manner.

Monitoring Authority

I.C. 5-2-6-3 designates the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute as the state agency to administer the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. The ICJI is provided authority to inspect detention records through I.C. 31-39-3-3, which provides that "records relating to the detention of any child in a secure facility shall be open to public inspection."

Violations Procedures and Sanctions

When the Compliance Monitor receives a complaint of a violation of the JJDP Act core requirements, the Compliance Monitor will inform the facility, in writing, of the alleged violation and request a documented response. After receiving the facility's response, the Compliance Monitor will perform an on-site inspection, if necessary, and will determine if a violation exists. The Compliance Monitor will then complete a JJDP Act Violation Report, which will be given to the facility contact person, the Juvenile Justice Specialist, and will put into the facility's file.

Facilities with a pattern of practice that violates the JJDP Act and facilities that refuse to provide documentation responding to violation allegations will be subject to the following sanctions:

- The withholding of federal funds to the facility and the county that houses the facility.
- Pursuit of legal remedies (i.e. writ of habeas corpus) on behalf of individual juveniles by the State Public Defender's Office.

- The approval of a Corrective Action Plan, including required training and technical assistance.

Barriers and Strategies

- Monitoring Authority An adequate compliance monitoring system provides either legislative or executive branch authority allowing the state agency to collect data and enter and inspect facilities for JJDP Act compliance. Such express authority does not currently exist in Indiana. Compliance monitoring has historically been conducted in Indiana upon informal agreements between facilities and the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI), as well as reliance upon a vague statute (I.C. 31-39-3-3) that has not been interpreted by Indiana Courts. This barrier can be overcome by pursuing the necessary legislative or executive branch authority. In 2006, the JJSAG approved a measure to have ICJI staff seek an Executive Order from the Governor's Office.
- Conflict between state law and JJDP Act The JJDP Act allows the holding of juveniles under adult court jurisdiction in adult facilities only on felony level offenses, while Indiana law allows the holding of juveniles under adult court jurisdiction in adult facilities on misdemeanor offenses, as well. Current Indiana law excludes juvenile court jurisdiction on Carrying a Handgun Without a License, a Class A Misdemeanor, at age 16. The holding of these handgun offenders in adult facilities beyond 6 hours violates the JJDP Act. This barrier can be overcome by pursuing legislation prohibiting the holding of juveniles under adult court jurisdiction in adult facilities on misdemeanor offenses. Legislation was introduced during the 2007 Legislative Session that would have resolved this conflict, but it did not receive a hearing. This legislation will continue to be pursued until passage.
- CHINS in secure residential facilities Pursuant to the JJDP Act, nonoffenders (i.e. CHINS) may not be housed in secure facilities. Based upon JJDP Act training conducted by the Youth Law T.E.A.M. of Indiana with residential facility staff in 2006, there is a belief that there are CHINS in secure residential facilities. This barrier can be overcome by: completing the compliance monitoring universe identification and classification function; requiring the facilities classified as secure to submit data via the web-based reporting system; and providing JJDP Act training and technical assistance to judges, DCS caseworkers and facility staff.

Plan for Compliance Monitoring for the First Three Core Requirements of the JJDP Act

Identification of the monitoring universe:

The Indiana Criminal Justice Institute provides a grant to the Youth Law T.E.A.M to serve as the Compliance Monitors for the state of Indiana. The following agencies will be contacted to obtain a current list of facilities that hold juveniles under court jurisdiction: (1) Indiana Department of Child Services; (2) Indiana Department of Corrections; (3)

Indiana Sheriffs' Association; (4) Indiana Association of Chiefs of Police; (5) Indiana Association of Residential Child Caring Agencies; and (5) Indiana Juvenile Detention Association. After receiving the current list, surveys will be submitted to the administrators of those facilities. Information collected, via the surveys, pertaining to the identification of facilities that hold juveniles under court jurisdiction will be recorded on the appropriate Monitoring Facility Master List.

Classification of facilities:

The information collected via the identification surveys submitted to juvenile holding facilities, pertaining to the classification of facilities will be recorded as (1) private or public; (2) juvenile, adult, or collocated; and (3) secure or non-secure on the appropriate Monitoring Facility Master List. The self-reported classifications of all facilities new to the compliance monitoring universe will be verified via on-site inspection. The classification of "collocated" must be reviewed annually with an onsite facility inspection.

Inspection of facilities:

Facility administrators will be contacted to schedule a date and time for a site inspection. The following will be performed at each inspection: (1) review of the physical accommodations; (2) the obtaining of a facility layout; (3) the obtaining of the facility's policies and procedures; (4) determination how each facility maintains its records; (5) a review of original data source for consistency with records reported to ICJI Compliance Monitor; and (6) the provision of training and technical assistance, when needed. Each facility will receive a copy of the Monitoring for Compliance with the JJDP Act manual. The Compliance Monitoring On-Site Summary Results will be made available to the facility as a record of findings of the inspection. Issues of facilities' noncompliance with site inspection requests will be addressed with the Juvenile Justice Specialist in written form, with a copy being sent to the non-cooperating facility. The site inspection records will be maintained in the facility's file. Frequency of on-site inspection will occur according to facility type: (1) all juvenile detention facilities will be inspected on an annual basis; (2) at least 10% of juvenile correctional facilities (including IDOC facilities and all identified residential facilities) will be inspected annually, with all facilities inspected within 3 years; (3) at least 10% of all adult jails and lockups will be inspected annually, with all inspected within 3 years.

Data Collection

Data will be collected in the following manner: (1) facilities identified and classified as secure will be required to report relevant data via the web-based reporting system. Facility staff will be trained on the web-based system; (2) facilities in counties using the Quest case management system will consult with the ICJI Compliance Monitor to ensure that data required under the JJDP Act is accurately reported through Quest; (3) facilities which do not have internet access will report data on the Log of Juveniles Held form and submit said forms to the ICJI Compliance Monitor on at least a monthly basis; (4)

facilities identified and classified as non-secure will submit written certification of non-secure status on an annual basis. Violation reports, monthly logs and data gathered will be maintained at the office of the ICJI Compliance Monitor for one year. Thereafter, the data will be maintained at the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute.

Data Verification

The web-based reporting system will generate a Violation Report of potential JJDP Act violations. The Violation Report will be reviewed on-site and compared to the original data source maintained by the facility. At least 10% of all VCO's will be verified by acquiring the appropriate court and detention documentation. Additionally, a random sample of all data reported will be reviewed on-site and compared to the original data source maintained by the facility. During the data verification process, identified and classified facilities which do not report data will be identified. The ICJI Compliance Monitor will send letters to those facilities offering Training and Technical Assistance in the development of record keeping systems.

Report Writing

Narrative portions of the annual report to the OJJDP will be written collaboratively by the ICJI Compliance Monitor and Juvenile Justice Specialist.

Training and Technical Assistance

Training and technical assistance on JJDP Act Compliance will be made available to all facilities and agencies within the JJDP compliance monitoring universe.

Role of SAG

The JJSAG for Indiana is comprised of 95% new membership. Upon training, our goal is to have members very engaged in actively supporting Compliance Monitoring. We anticipate SAG members to be active in supporting any legislative push that needs to happen in order to change Indiana laws to reflect that of the federal law. Discussions have been made in tying the Indiana counties' status of compliance with the JJDP Act to that of eligibility to apply for funding through the grant programs. We anticipate JJSAG support as advocates and spokesmen of their respective counties to enforce the seriousness of this.

PLAN FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE DISPROPORTIONATE MINORITY CONTACT (DMC) CORE REQUIREMENT

Indiana has committed to reassessing and identifying disproportionate minority contact (DMC) throughout the state. It is noted that this will be Indiana's third attempt in addressing DMC in Indiana. Similarly to the past, Indiana still can not afford the attention or resources necessary towards DMC progress, however, with the assistance of a DMC Coordinator an ample amount of time and dedication has been spent on prioritizing DMC

for Indiana. The Indiana Criminal Justice Institute has once again undergone reorganization but re-evaluating Indiana's DMC plan remains critical to Executive Administration and Management.

Indiana's efforts to address DMC through Defining the Problem include two parts: identification and assessment. For Title II funding year 2006-2007, the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute awarded the Center for Evaluation and Education Policy (CEEP) a grant to analyze data extracted from the QUEST case management system from ten Indiana counties. QUEST data will permit the examination of minority representation at all possible stages or decision points of the juvenile justice process in Indiana, from arrest and the decision to temporarily detain to disposition and commitments to periods of secure confinement in state correctional facilities.² Information gathered will assist in demonstrating the following: a) it is possible to develop a model that can lead to the identification of precursors to DMC, and b) provide information data, that if replicated, clearly implicate initial contact (arrest) as the most significant contributor to DMC.³ It is important to note that seven of the ten counties include, Allen, Howard, Lake, Madison, Marion, St. Joseph, and Tippecanoe, which collectively represent 70% of all juvenile justice cases processed in the state⁴ and five of the seven are considered to be the highest populated minority counties throughout the state.⁵

While analysis is being conducted by CEEP to acquire quantitative data, which has been recognized to be difficult since there is no uniform in how data is reported, the DMC Coordinator in collaboration with representatives of both public and private sectors has established the Indiana Disproportionality Committee (IDC). The Committee represents a systemic entity fusing together the child welfare, education, juvenile justice and mental health realms. The Committee focuses on integrating methods and strategies to address disproportionality across systems simultaneously and to break down barriers established between entities. The over-arching principles of the Committee are as follows:

- Illustrate to the community disparities regarding children of color in all Indiana systems;
- Promote public policies that achieve parity for children of color within all Indiana systems;
- Provide research support to the IDC and partnering agencies for data collection, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of efforts to reduce and eliminate disproportionality;
- Secure adequate volunteers, financial and in-kind contributions to support the IDC and partnering agencies to carry out the mission of IDC;
- Provide culturally and age appropriate skills development opportunities and resources to all public and private professionals who work with children and families.

² ICJI Plan for Reducing the Disproportionate Representation of Minority Youth Confined in Secure Facilities

³ IU CEEP DMC in Indiana: Proposed Next Steps Handout, 2007

⁴ ICJI Research Division Personal Communication, 2002

⁵ Indiana Youth Institute, Kids Count Databook 2005

The Committee has achieved many accomplishments since its inception in November 2004. The Committee facilitates focus groups and has had dialogue regarding disproportionality with over 110 participants statewide. The Committee works from 85 bulk slides to manipulate presentations for each facilitation/presentation opportunity so individuals can obtain a clear understanding of what disproportionality is and how it directly impacts them. With support from twenty-one organizations and sixty-six active participants on the Committee resources such as an annotated bibliography, glossary of terms, fast facts handout and brochure have been produced, and two grants have been submitted. The Indiana Criminal Justice Institute is the central repository for all Committee efforts and meeting minutes. Therefore, list-serves and a State DMC webpage have been created. Recently the Committee has introduced a bill to establish a Commission on Disproportionality. With the creation of the Commission the Committee will serve as the Advisory Board and resource to Commission members to ensure that disproportionality is tracked and documented accurately at all stages in all systems.

As Indiana develops and implements their DMC plan of action, the DMC Coordinator will work closely with the Juvenile Justice Specialist and with Indiana's SRAD Representative along with Heidi Hsia to address any areas of concern. Anticipated next steps will proceed as follows:

- Phase One: Determine *whether* DMC exists (Continue efforts).
- Phase Two: Identify *where* DMC exists
- Phase Three: Determine *why* DMC exists
- Phase Four: Identify measurement tools
- Phase Five: Implement evidence-based programming

Indiana Criminal Justice Institute is affiliated with other initiatives targeting disproportionality statewide. Other DMC efforts include:

- State of Our Black Youth (SOBY) – Indianapolis Committee
- Indiana Civil Rights Commission - Education Steering Committee
- Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative
- Indiana University Center for Education and Evaluation Policy
- IARCCA's Outcome Measures Project
- Including DMC information in MSW curriculum at Indiana University School of Social Work
- Children and Adolescent Needs and Strengths (CANS) Mental Health Statewide Initiative
- State Bar Association and Indiana Minority Health Coalition – Mental Health Assessment Collaboration

Indiana will continue to utilize “Seven Steps to Develop and Evaluate Strategies to Reduce Disproportionate Minority Contact” and OJJDP's DMC Technical Assistance Manual for reference.

Coordination of Child Abuse and Neglect and Delinquency Programs (No Change)

Program Descriptions

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM FUNDING AREAS

- A. State Program Designator:** *01, Planning & Administration*
- B. Standard Program Area Code:** *23*
- C. Title:**
Planning & Administration
- D. Program Problem Statement**
NA
- E. Program Goal(s)/Objectives/Performance Indicators/Activities and Services Planned**
- Goal:** Increase the capacity of the Youth Division of ICJI (DSA) to adequately administer the Title II Formula Grant program and serve as the State's leader in juvenile justice planning.
- Objective 1:** Improve the administration of and planning for the Title II Formula Grant program in Indiana.
- Performance Indicators:**
- 1) Number of plans or plan updates submitted
 - 2) Number of subgrants awarded
 - 3) Number of programmatic site visits conducted
 - 4) Number of SAG and Board of Trustees meetings staffed
 - 5) Number of planning meetings conducted
 - 6) Change in number of programmatic site visits conducted
 - 7) Improvements to administration of Formula Grants program
- Activities:** Continue to improve the administration of the Formula Grants program through changes in application, reporting, monitoring, and evaluation procedures. Plans include utilizing Governor's Commission for a Drug-Free Indiana system of community consultants to conduct programmatic site visits, determine training and technical assistance needs, and provide technical assistance regarding application and administration procedures at the local level. Move towards electronic

submission of all subgrant documents and provide for electronic review of grant applications.

Budget: 10% of award

A. State Program Designator: *02, Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group Allocation*

B. Standard Program Area Code: *31*

C. Title:
State Advisory Group Allocation

D. Program Problem Statement
NA

E. Program Goal(s)/Objectives/Performance Indicators/Activities and Services Planned

Goal: Raise the level of participation, involvement and capability of the JJSAG to engage in statewide planning for juvenile justice improvement, monitoring for compliance with the JJDPA, and judicious use of federal funding streams.

Objective 1: Increase and diversity JJSAG membership.

Performance Indicators:

- 1) Percentage of members appointed while under the age of 24
- 2) Percentage of members who are full-time employees of Federal , State, or local government
- 3) Number of members currently or previously under juvenile court jurisdiction
- 4) Type of professional fields represented

Activities: Work with current JJSAG members, ICJI staff and the Governor's Office to identify and appoint new JJSAG members.

Objective 2: Increase the capacity of the JJSAG to engage in planning and evaluation activities.

Performance Indicators:

- 1) Number of site visits attended by JJSAG members
- 2) Number of JJSAG members active in the development of the State Plan
- 3) Number of grant applications reviewed, objectively evaluated and commented on
- 4) State compliance recommendations submitted to the Governor and legislature

- 5) Submission of annual report
- 6) JJSAG oversight of funding decisions
- 7) Percentage of JJSAG recommendations implemented

Activities: Provide training to JJSAG members on program evaluation, best practices and evidence-based programming. Provide opportunities for JJSAG members to attend site visits or funded activities. Work with JJSAG members to conduct regular planning meetings. Fully staff regular bimonthly JJSAG meetings.

Budget: 2% of award

A. State Program Designator: *03, Coordinated & Comprehensive Mental Health*

Services

B. Standard Program Area Code: *20*

C. Title:
Mental Health Services

D. Program Problem Statement

Each year, more than two million youth under age 18 are arrested. A million of them will have formal contact with the juvenile justice system, and more than 100,000 will eventually be removed from their homes and placed in juvenile detention and/or correctional facilities. Available research indicates that at least 20 percent of all youth who enter the juvenile justice system experience serious mental disorders, with a much higher percentage experiencing some level of mental health problems. There is also a growing recognition that many of these youths, nearly 50 to 75 percent have serious substance abuse problems.

The lack of comprehensive mental health services available for at-risk juveniles and juveniles already within the juvenile justice system has been identified as a priority issue in the State. There is a growing recognition that many youth are entering the juvenile justice system with co-occurring disorders⁶ that have been unrecognized and misunderstood. The extent and nature of this problem varies statewide. The problem is further exacerbated by a lack of available statewide data with regards to the mental health needs of at-risk or delinquent youth and the array of services available in jurisdictions to meet those needs. Previously, the Criminal Justice Institute addressed this gap in information by utilizing Challenge Grant monies to fund a statewide Juvenile Detention Mental Health and Substance Abuse Needs Assessment. This was the first step in providing comprehensive mental services to at-risk and delinquent youth.

⁶ For example, data reveal that many of Indiana's youth are faced with multi-faceted problems such as family dysfunction, mental health disorders, substance abuse, educational failure, etc.

Preliminary results from the Juvenile Detention Mental Health and Substance Abuse Needs Assessment have revealed that juveniles entering detention centers throughout the state have substantial mental health and substance abuse treatment needs that have often been undiagnosed and untreated. For example, in the sample completed the assessment instrument the incidence of self-reported physical and sexual abuse was thirty (30) times higher than what is seen in the general youth population. While a quarter of respondents reported that several times they had wanted to kill themselves.

The second step involves the need for coordination among and across systems. There is a need to develop new linkages between mental health, substance abuse and criminal justice systems. These linkages can provide appropriate interventions to break the cycles of decomposition and incarceration in these people's lives that repeatedly harm them and the communities in which they live. All three systems must recognize the need for a holistic approach to treating each person and should be willing to share information, money and clients across these systems.

E. Program Goal(s)/Objectives/Performance Indicators/Activities and Services Planned

Goal: To promote and support the development of comprehensive and coordinated mental health services for at-risk and delinquent youth.

Objective 1: To increase statewide capacity address the multi-faceted needs of both at-risk and delinquent youth exhibiting mental health or co-occurring disorders through coordinated mental health services and/or systems-of-care.

Performance Indicators:

- 1) Number and percentage of juveniles screened for substance abuse or mental health problems
- 2) Percentage of juveniles screened and found to have mental health or co-occurring disorders who received services
- 3) Utilization rate for mental health services
- 4) Percentage of juveniles served with Serious Emotional Disturbances (SED)
- 5) Length of stay (LOS) for inpatient services
- 6) Recidivism (rearrests, recommitments) occurring within 12 months after completion of the program/treatment
- 7) Evidence of changes in family relationships after the program compared to before
- 8) Measurable changes in program participant functioning after completion of the program

Activities: Collaborate with FSSA/DMHA to continue to develop and support a statewide system-of-care that will fully incorporate juveniles entering

the justice system through delinquency or status offenses. Fund only evidence-based programs at the local level (e.g. SAMSHA, CSAP, OJJDP database).

Budget: 20% of Award

A. State Program Designator: *04, JJDP Compliance Monitoring*

B. Standard Program Area Code: *06*

C. Title:
Compliance Monitoring

D. Program Problem Statement

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002 requires states to meet core requirements regarding the detention of juveniles in order to receive Formula Grants funding. Section 223(a)(11) of the JJDP Act provides that:

...juveniles who are charged with or who have committed offenses that would not be criminal if committed by an adult...or alien juveniles in custody, or such nonoffenders as dependent or neglected children, shall not be placed in secure detention facilities, or secure adult detention facilities or secure correctional facilities.

The exceptions to the Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO) requirement include: the detention of accused status offenders in juvenile detention facilities for up to twenty-four (24) hours pending an initial hearing; and adjudicated status offenders being held in a juvenile detention facility on a violation of a Valid Court Order provided that a hearing is held within twenty-four (24) hours with all due process rights being met.

Section 223(a)(13) of the JJDP Act involves the removal of delinquent (criminal) offenders from jails. The act mandates that juveniles are not to be detained or confined in any jail or lockup for adults. The exceptions to this requirement include: the detention of accused delinquent offenders in adult facilities for up to six (6) hours in order to conduct identification and processing and to find adequate alternative placement for the juvenile; and detention for up to six (6) hours immediately following a court appearance. In both cases, Section 223(a)(12) of the JJDP act provides that juveniles detained in adult facilities will be guaranteed sight and sound separation from adults held in the same facility.⁷

While the Public Defender Litigation and Jail Removal/Juvenile Alternatives Projects established over a decade ago were successful in bringing the State into compliance with the JJDP Act and raising awareness among juvenile justice professionals and community members regarding the unlawful detention of juveniles, it appears that a renewed commitment to these efforts is necessary across the State. While violations

⁷ The exception to the sight and sound separation requirement involves accidental or inadvertent contact in secure areas of the facility not dedicated to juvenile offenders (e.g., booking areas).

of the deinstitutionalization of status offenders (DSO) and jail removal core requirements of the JJDP Act had dropped dramatically in the State, results from Compliance Monitoring Reports since 2001 have indicated erratic increases in violations, which threatens the State's compliance status and future funding.

With regards to DSO there are three types of status offenders that continue to be a challenge in maintaining compliance with this core requirement:

- Accused status offenders, particularly runaways, held at juvenile detention centers for over 24 hours;
- Accused status offenders, mainly juveniles accused of minor consumption, held at secure adult facilities due to confusion over the Indiana Code regarding these offenders; and
- Adjudicated status offenders sentenced to juvenile detention center.

In addition to these type specific issues, the efforts to expand the monitoring universe and improve the level of monitoring for DSO have revealed that there are many private, residential treatment facilities currently housing status offenders for treatment purposes under juvenile court order (rather than a civil commitment). The Youth Division, in collaboration with the YLT has begun to partner with the Indiana Association of Residential Child Caring Agencies (IARCCA) to identify any and all facilities that are or potentially could be holding status offenders (securely or non-securely) under juvenile court jurisdiction in order to provide training/technical assistance regarding the JJPDA and to establish compliance monitoring data collection and site visit schedules.

With regards to jail removal and sight/sound requirements, Indiana continues to be in compliance with the sight/sound separation mandate thanks in large part to the statewide efforts of the Jail Removal/Juvenile Alternatives Project. Unfortunately jail removal violations continue to be at unacceptable levels, often due to a lack of alternative placements within the community. While the Jail Removal/Juvenile Alternatives Project made great strides in increasing the availability of alternatives to secure detention for juveniles across the State, this continues to be a challenge faced by Indiana's communities. Particularly rural Indiana counties faced by costly and timely transportation options, with little community-based programming.

E. Program Goal(s)/Objectives/Performance Indicators/Activities and Services Planned

Goal(s):

- To reduce the number of accused status offenders held for longer than 24 hours and adjudicated status offenders for any length of time in secure facilities.
- To reduce the number of juveniles inappropriately detained in adult jails and lock-ups.
- To provide training and technical assistance to members of the judiciary, law enforcement, probation, juvenile service providers,

and the community, including juveniles, regarding compliance with the JJDP Act.

Objective 1: Increase the capacity of the State to adequately monitor all facilities for compliance with the JJDP Act of 2002.

Performance Indicators:

- 1) Rollout of Web-based reporting system by end of CY2006. Number of facilities identified and included in the monitoring universe compared with the total number of facilities in the State.
- 2) Number of facilities self-reporting on the "Monthly Log of Juveniles Held database" compared to the number non-reporting facilities.
- 3) Number of facilities to receive an on-site compliance monitoring visit.
- 4) Number of confirmed violations.
- 5) Submission of Annual Monitoring Report to OJJDP by reporting deadline.
- 6) Achievement of numerical de minimis noncompliance levels.
- 7) Percentage of facilities in compliance with the JJDP Act.
- 8) Number of JJ practitioners trained about the JJDP Act.

Activities: Fund a full-time compliance monitor through a subgrant to the YLT of Indiana. Receive compliance monitoring data from public and private facilities, while continuing to expand the monitoring universe by identifying all facilities that could potentially hold juveniles under juvenile court jurisdiction. Maintain the Compliance Monitoring access database at ICJI. Conduct site visits. Analyze compliance monitoring data annually for the Annual Monitoring Report and work with facilities/communities found to be out of compliance with the JJDP Act to develop violation reduction plans.

Objective 2: Increase the capacity of the Youth Division to provide training and technical assistance to members of the judiciary, law enforcement, probation, juvenile service providers, and the community, including juveniles, regarding compliance with the JJDP Act. Enhance data set and ability to provide quantitative analyses of trends and issues in offending and regarding DMC.

Performance Indicators:

- 1) Number of facilities receiving technical assistance compared to the number of requests for technical assistance

- 2) Number of trainings conducted for a) judiciary, b) law enforcement , c) probation, d) juvenile service providers (public or private), e) general public (including juveniles)
- 3) Response time to public inquiries regarding potential violations or general JJDP or juvenile code questions
- 4) Increase in key stakeholder knowledge regarding JJDP and juvenile code regarding the proper handling of juveniles
- 5) Change in facility and/or juvenile justice system policies and practices to align with the JJDP

Activities: Partner with the YLT of Indiana to provide JJDP training and technical assistance. Take advantage of opportunities to provide statewide training through the Indiana Judicial Center, Probation Officer's Association, Indiana Juvenile Detention Association, Sheriff's Association, Chiefs of Police, Juvenile Judges Symposium, IARCCA membership forums, etc.

Budget: 15% of award

A. State Program Designator: 05, Primary Delinquency Prevention

B. Standard Program Area Code: 09

C. Title:
Delinquency Prevention

D. Program Problem Statement

The Juvenile Justice SAG and Youth Division of the ICJI Board of Trustees recognize the importance of primary prevention as an effective and cost-efficient means of crime control. What appears to be continued decreases in levels of funding nationwide for primary delinquency prevention efforts to fund sound, research-based prevention programming was a problem that the planning group (made up of individuals from the groups above) felt required a continued commitment from the State.

Increases in all types of juvenile court case filings reveal a continued need to focus on delinquency prevention and intervention, but the dramatic increases in CHINS and Status filings (60% and 94% respectively over the last decade) indicate that efforts to address at-risk conditions and high-risk behaviors that can lead to further delinquency involvement are needed and necessary. Indiana citizens support this assertion through their responses to a survey recently conducted by Indiana Criminal Justice Institute, *Indiana Citizens' Perspectives on Crime Survey*. The survey revealed that when asked to name one thing that is most often the root cause of crime committed by youth ages

10-17 over a quarter of respondents cited either “poor upbringing” or “drugs and alcohol”.

E. Program Goal(s)/Objectives/Performance Indicators/Activities and Services Planned

Goal: To reduce delinquency in Indiana through primary delinquency prevention programming and positive youth development initiatives.

Objective 1: Increase the capacity of local communities to address the needs of at-risk youth in order to reduce/prevent juvenile delinquency.

Performance Indicators:

- 1) Number and type of programs from the OJJDP *Model Programs Guide and Database* implemented
- 2) Number of communities to incorporate risk/protective factors or asset model into a primary delinquency prevention plan
- 3) Number of youth diverted from formal juvenile justice system
- 4) Frequency and severity of program participants high-risk behaviors
- 5) Change in juvenile arrest rate for curfew, vandalism, disorderly conduct, incorrigibility, and runaway

Activities: Incorporate information from and links to OJJDP’s *Model Programs Guide and Database* in to the Formula Grant RFP. Require that all programs applying for the primary delinquency program area implement programs from either the OJJDP database or another approved listing of evidence-based programs (e.g, CSAP or SAMSHA). Provide opportunities for subgrantees to receive training and technical assistance in program development, implementation and evaluation and innovations in positive youth development (partner with the Indiana Youth Institute to keep subgrantees informed of such opportunities outside the Youth Division.). Track arrest trends and other measures of high-risk behavior statewide.

Budget: 20% of award

A. State Program Designator: 06, *Disproportionate Minority Contact*

B. Standard Program Area Code: 10

C. Title:
Disproportionate Minority Contact

D. Program Problem Statement

The December 1999, OJJDP Juvenile Justice Bulletin, *Minorities in the Juvenile Justice System* summarized the relationship of minority overrepresentation to Formula Grant funding:

Since 1988, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act has required States that receive Formula Grants program funding to determine whether the proportion of juvenile minorities in confinement exceeds their proportion of the population and, if so, to develop corrective strategies. In 1992, Congress strengthened the national commitment to addressing disproportionate minority confinement of minority youth in secure facilities by elevating this issue to a 'core requirement' of the JJDP Act.

Nationally, statistics reveal that minority youth, particularly African-American males, are disproportionately represented at each level of the juvenile justice system. While statistics do reveal disproportionate minority confinement among Indiana's black juveniles⁸, little is currently known about its causes and the current extent of minority overrepresentation at each level of the State's juvenile justice system.

Research was conducted on minority overrepresentation in Indiana over nine (9) years ago, timeliness of the data as well as an increase in the level of minority youth around the State (particularly youth of Hispanic origin) suggests that new research should be conducted. This was the conclusion and recommendation of Indiana's *Disproportionate Minority Confinement: Intervention Plan* submitted to OJJDP in March of 1999.

Progress towards completing this research has been slow, but aggregate statistics do reveal at least the presence of DMC for African-American youth in Indiana, but falls short of providing the causal factors leading to disproportionate minority contact. For example while the 2000 census revealed that African-American youth constitute approximately 10% of the overall juvenile population in the State, thirty-three percent (33%) of the reported juvenile arrests in 2001 were of African-American youth. Interestingly, African-American youth are also disproportionately represented in all but juvenile miscellaneous (JM) filings which include agreements for informal adjustment rather than formal adjudication (African-American youth represent 38% of delinquency filings, 20% of status filings, and 34% of CHINS filings). Finally, African-American youth represented thirty-nine percent (39%) of commitments to secure correctional facilities throughout the State as of January 1, 2003.

⁸ See Graph 2 page 28, Graph 4 page 30, Chart 19 page 32 and *Corrections* section narrative page 34.

**E. Program Goal(s)/Objectives/Performance Indicators/Activities and Services
Planned**

Goal: Increase statewide capacity to identify and reduce the disproportionate number of minority juveniles who come into contact with the juvenile justice system.

Objective 1: Maintain full-time DMC coordinator position and presence/leadership role on the Indiana Disproportionality Committee. Work with juvenile justice system stakeholders to increase the capacity of local communities (when appropriate) to identify and address the underlying causes of disproportionate minority contact.

Performance Indicators:

- 1) Type of data collection and information-sharing systems improvements made statewide or within a local jurisdiction
- 2) Percentage of court/detention/corrections staff who reflect similar proportions of minority populations
- 3) Number of culturally appropriate offender and victim services compared with number expected
- 4) Changes in annual Disproportionate Minority Contact Index at each decision point in the system (arrest, referral, diversion, detention, petition, adjudication, probation, corrections and transfer to adult court)
- 5) Evidence of more reliable and valid data collections/analysis capacity compared to before funding

Activities: Work with ICJI Research Division (State Statistical Analysis Center) to facilitate collection of DMC matrices data and conduct analysis of data for DMC index. Collaborate with Indiana Judicial Center, Division of State Court Administration, and counties with Quest database systems to facilitate improvements in data collection, information-sharing and data submission for DMC. Work with ICJI Research Division to conduct further analysis of the underlying causes of potential DMC, provide technical assistance to jurisdictions to address DMC and work with JJSAG to develop statewide strategies to address DMC.

Objective 2: Identify and support programs/initiatives with the greatest to potential to impact disproportionate minority contact.

Performance Indicators:

- 1) Number and percentage of staff (program, agency, unit, facility, etc.) trained in cultural competency reporting/grant period

- 2) Increase in the number of community-based programs targeting minority youth
- 3) Number and types of objective decision-making tools used at specified juvenile justice decision points
- 4) Changes in annual Disproportionate Minority Contact Index at each decision point in the system (arrest, referral, diversion, detention, petition, adjudication, probation, corrections and transfer to adult court)

Activities: Work with ICJI Research Division and the IU Center on Environmental and Education Policy to conduct further analysis of the underlying causes of potential DMC, provide technical assistance to jurisdictions to address DMC and work with JJSAG to develop statewide strategies to address DMC. Fund programs at the local level (when appropriate) to address DMC or prevent DMC from occurring.

Budget: 10% of award

A. State Program Designator: 07, *Gender Relevant Programming*

B. Standard Program Area Code: 13

C. Title:
Gender-Specific Services

D. Program Problem Statement

National and State data reveal the juvenile female offenders are increasingly involved with the juvenile justice system for more serious offenses. Further research has revealed the differences in the development pathways between adolescent boys and girls and the associated risks factors for the onset of female delinquent and at-risk behavior. OJJDP's *Guiding Principles for Promising Female Programming: An Inventory of Best Practices* (October 1998) reveals that:

For decades, girls who have broken the law have entered a juvenile justice system that was designed to help someone else. Boys commit the overwhelming number of juvenile crimes, and their offenses tend to be more violent and dangerous than the status offenses most girls commit. It's no wonder then, that female delinquents have been overlooked and neglected by a system engineered to help troubled boys become law-abiding men.

The report goes on to indicate that two trends are changing the landscape of gender-specific programming. First, the number of girls entering the juvenile justice system is growing at alarmingly high rates (faster than the rates for male delinquent offenders) and girls are entering the system at younger ages for more serious offenses, including such violent crime as assaults. Second, research has revealed the need for

programming focused on the specific development needs and associated risk factors faced by at-risk adolescent females. For example, female delinquents are far more likely to have been victims of sexual or physical abuse, a risk factor for subsequent delinquent behavior.

Currently the level of female involvement in the juvenile justice system in Indiana, as well as the availability of gender-specific programming statewide is relatively unknown. In the Spring of 2002 Indiana's Gender Relevant Programming Initiative (IGRPI) was launched in concert with the annual Keeping Kids Safe Conference co-sponsored by the ICJI and Community System wide Response of the Purdue 4-H Youth Development Department. One day of the conference was dedicated to introducing key stakeholders from around the state to gender-relevant programming concepts and issues and describing existing promising gender-specific initiatives/programs in Indiana. Dr. Sheila Peters of Greene, Peters & Associates led the day-long workshop. The following day, approximately 20 juvenile justice, mental health, academic, and prevention professionals from around the State attended the first IGRPI Workgroup meeting. Overviews of the current status of female and male juveniles in Indiana and information about ongoing gender-specific initiatives in other states were provided. These presentations stimulated conversation about what Indiana's gender-specific initiative should involve. Verbatim responses of IGRPI Workgroup members to the question "Based on the information provided in the morning presentations and what you already know about gender-specific issues, what do we still need to know?" included:

- Research on developmental differences and delinquency pathways for males and females;
- Concise definition of gender-specific;
- More data across disciplines – criminal justice, mental health, victimization, socio-economic, demographic;
- Input of the juvenile female population served;
- Views of juvenile justice professionals and parents of delinquent females;
- Need for theoretically driven programs and empirically driven policy;
- Current availability of gender-specific programming;
- Best practices, model programs;
- Outcome measures; and
- Selling this as an important issue – identifying political champions.

Information gathered during the IGRPI Workgroup meeting was used to inform a research plan that was then funded through a *SAC Evaluation Partnership Program* grant through Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA). The final results of the initiative were presented in the summer of 2004.

E. Program Goal(s)/Objectives/Performance Indicators/Activities and Services Planned

Goal: Support the development, implementation, and evaluation of empirically based gender relevant programming statewide.

Objective 1: Increase statewide capacity to address the gender-relevant needs of at-risk and delinquent youth through empirically-based programming.

Performance Indicators:

- 1) Number of gender-relevant programs developed and implemented
- 2) Percentage of youth to successfully complete the program
- 3) Utilization rate for the program (number of placements (referrals/program capacity)
- 4) Percentage of staff to receive gender-relevant or adolescent development training
- 5) Changes in program participants demonstration of appropriate social skills
- 6) Changes in program participants relationship with parents and family
- 7) Number juveniles diverted from formal juvenile justice system
- 8) Recidivism (rearrest, recommitments) of juveniles who receive gender-relevant programming within 12 months of completion compared with juveniles who did not receive gender-relevant programming

Activities: Complete the Indiana Gender Relevant Programming Initiative study (IGRPI) and disseminate statewide. Provide opportunities for local communities to receive training and technical assistance on gender-relevant programming. Support and replicate promising programs.

Budget: 6% of award

A. State Program Designator: 08, *Graduated Sanctions*

B. Standard Program Area Code: 14

C. Title:
Graduated Sanctions

D. Program Problem Statement

Funding for standard program area 14, Graduated Sanctions is based on problem statement B from Indiana's *Three Year Delinquency Prevention & Systems Improvement Plan, FY 2006-2008*:

There is a lack of resources for sound researched-based intervention programs in the areas of aftercare, juvenile probation and both non-secure and secure juvenile programs/facilities. Specifically, programming to address cognitive-behavioral based approaches, mental health needs, life

skills, work-force development, graduated sanctions, etc., within the justice system and youth-serving agencies should be emphasized. (Should be noted that resources in these areas have increased with the implementation of JABG that is designed to address such programming needs.)

With the imminent reductions in JABG funding, support to allow local juvenile courts to implement promising programs and best practices to bridge the gap between traditional probation and secure corrections will once again be severely limited.

Indiana has been experiencing an overall decrease in juvenile arrests since peaks in 1996, there have been slight increases since 1999 with reported arrests for violent crimes increasing fifteen percent (15%) and for property crimes six percent (6%) during this time period. While aggregate data reveal relatively positive strides in decreasing juvenile crime in general, trends for specific offenses indicate a continued need to support evidence-based programming at the community level. For example, the reported juvenile arrest rates for aggravated assaults and other assaults have increased twenty-four percent (24%) and twenty-one percent (21%) between 1999 and 2001. The reported juvenile arrest rates for driving under the influence have increased forty-one percent (41%) during the same time period.

Local juvenile courts, probation departments, and community corrections agencies are being forced to serve increasing numbers of juveniles while experiencing decreases in budgets, particularly in the areas of programming and training. The number of juvenile cases filed in Indiana's juvenile courts between 1991 and 2001 has increased sixty-one (61%) for juvenile delinquency cases, sixty percent (60%) for CHINS cases, and a startling ninety-four percent (94%) for status offender cases. During the same time period the number of juvenile miscellaneous cases filed, which includes informal adjustments, declined thirty percent (30%).

While the number of juvenile referrals and post-judgment supervisions received by probation departments statewide has decreased slightly in the past four (4) years (12% for supervisions and 13% for referrals); this follows a period of substantial increases in the population served between 1989 and 1998 (47% increase in supervisions and 43% increase in referrals during this time period), leading to substantially higher probation populations served without an equivalent increase in probation resources. Interestingly, while probation referrals and supervisions have decreased slightly since 1999 the number of commitments to Indiana's secure juvenile correctional facilities had increased fifty-four percent (54%) from 1184 commitments in 1999 to 1824 commitments as of January 1, 2003. However, since 2005, the DOC commitment rate is approximately 50% of the January 1, 2003 rate at any given point.

E. Program Goal(s)/Objectives/Performance Indicators/Activities and Services Planned

Goal: Increase statewide knowledge of and capacity to deliver a system of graduated sanctions.

Objective 1: Investigate and identify potential changes in statutes policies, and justice system practices necessary to develop a statewide structure to support implementation of graduate sanctions.

Performance Indicators:

- 1) Number of trainings and provision of technical assistance provided to local communities on graduated sanctions
- 2) Number of sanctioning options available statewide
- 3) Changes in statute, policies, and justice system practices to support graduated sanctions
- 4) Commitment rate to secure correctional facilities

Activities: Work with Governor's Juvenile Law Commission to review and recommend statutory changes and provide guidance on appropriate policies and practices to support graduated sanctions. Provide increased opportunities for statewide training and technical assistance on developing systems of graduated sanctions.

Objective 2: Increase capacity of local jurisdictions to implement a full range of graduated sanctions.

Performance Indicators:

- 1) Number of sanction options available at each point in the continuum (immediate, intermediate, secure care, and aftercare) compared to before funding
- 2) Utilization rate for each program
- 3) Ratio of juveniles involved in sanctions program to available slots for each sector of the continuum
- 4) Time between offense and sanction
- 5) Recidivism (rearrests ore recommitments) occurring within 12 months after the program completion
- 6) Number of juveniles diverted from secure care

Activities: Provide information regarding graduated sanctions and links to evidence-based models on Youth Division website and in the RFP process for Title II Formula grants. Provide opportunities for training and technical assistance on graduated sanctions. Fund local programs to develop and/or implement a system of graduated sanctions locally.

Budget: 10% of Award

A. State Program Designator: 09, Juvenile Justice System Improvement

B. Standard Program Area Code: 19

C. Title:
Juvenile Justice System Improvement

D. Program Problem Statement

Indiana's juvenile justice system is largely decentralized, fragmented and in many areas lacks resources, particularly with regard to funds to improve the operations and coordination of the juvenile justice system statewide and at the local level. This problem manifests itself in a variety of ways: a lack of integrated juvenile data systems; the inability to track juvenile offenders through the juvenile justice and social service systems; inconsistency and differing resource levels to divert juveniles; variance in decision-making to incarcerate juveniles; insufficient alternatives to incarceration; lack of coordinated prevention programming; inadequate interagency coordination and information-sharing; and inadequate after-care resources for juveniles returning to their communities.

E. Program Goal(s)/Objectives/Performance Indicators/Activities and Services Planned

Goal:

- To increase interagency coordination and information-sharing to promote comprehensive, community-wide delinquency prevention and intervention planning.
- To promote a system that values and supports community-based planning to implement evidence programming and services.
- To promote coordination of existing coalitions, boards and service providers to reduce service and planning duplication.

Objective 1: Increase the capacity of local jurisdictions to implement information-sharing programs/initiatives in order to improve service delivery and decrease duplication of services/efforts.

Performance Indicators:

- 1) # of memorandums of understanding established/maintained to conduct information-sharing at the local level
- 2) Number of staff hours dedicated to system improvement/information-sharing activities
- 3) Number of jurisdictions to implement/improve information-sharing systems
- 4) Reductions in the level of system duplication of efforts (intakes, assessments, evaluations, referrals and services)

Activities: Collaborate with the Judicial Improvement Committee (Judicial Center), Division of State Court Administration, and

Probation Officer's Association to identify the most promising information-sharing models and technology and provide funding to support the implementation of such models at the local level.

Objective 2: Increase statewide juvenile justice system capacity to engage in community-wide planning to reduce duplication of services and implement evidence-based programming.

Performance Indicators:

- 1) Number of grants applied for to conduct research or evaluation of juvenile justice decision making or programs
- 2) Number of current Juvenile Justice Service Improvement committees or related ongoing initiatives
- 3) Systems improvements made as a result of funded research or committee activities
- 4) Change in the number of subgrantees to conduct rigorous program evaluations

Activities: Work with ICJI Research Division and OJJDP's technical assistance provider to provide information and training to subgrantees on program evaluation. Link subgrantees to evaluation resources within the State (e.g., Indiana Youth Institute) and through OJJDP (technical assistance). Work with on-going juvenile justice system improvement committees and initiatives (e.g., Juvenile Justice Improvement Committee, Juvenile Law Commission, Indiana State Bar Association (ISBA) Committee on the Legal Rights of Juveniles, Youth Law TEAM of Indiana).

Budget: 7% of award

GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

The Research Division of the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute in conjunction with the Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis, Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, are developing a GIS system for implementation across all divisions of the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute, the designated State SAC for Indiana to be rolled out by 2007.

The State of Indiana is committed to providing the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention with geographic information which includes all JABG, Title II, Title V, EUDL and any other OJP subgrantee information deemed necessary. The state will acquire all mapping information to be used for strategic planning by engaging the Office of Technology to support this endeavor. The Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) will provide the physical address as well as the service area, and demographic information of the populations served by each subgrantee.

Indiana Criminal Justice Institute
State Assurances re: Evidence-based Programming, Demonstration of Success
and GIS Commitment

The state shall, to the extent practicable, give priority in funding to evidence-based programs and activities.

The state agrees to give priority to evidence-based programs and activities and will encourage subgrantees and potential subgrantees to acquaint themselves with the OJJDP model programs guide as well as the Helping America's Youth initiative. Further, we anticipate identifying successful programs in our Title II Formula Grant program which may endeavor to become model programs.

The state shall not continue to fund a program if the subgrant recipient fails to demonstrate substantial success in meeting the goals specified in the original subgrant application.

The state requires quarterly narrative progress and financial reports from all subgrantees. The Indiana Criminal Justice Institute Youth Division has also recently hired a grant compliance liaison whose role is to provide technical assistance to subgrantees and perform site visits to ensure program efficacy and compliance. The state, with the support of adequate grants management of the Youth Division and the advisement of the JJSAG, will not continue to fund a program if it finds that the subgrant recipient fails, in 2 years, to demonstrate substantial success in meeting the goals specified in the original subgrant application.

Please provide a description of how the state plans to obtain geographic information from each subgrant recipient and a statement indicating the state's commitment to fulfilling this requirement.

The state is committed to gathering demographic and geographic data regarding all programs funded by OJJDP through the Youth Division. Our grant applications as well as quarterly reporting forms along with the DCTAT will inform our future delinquency prevention and intervention planning. The Youth Division grants liaison has begun mapping the OJJDP programs which have been funded through the Youth Division during FFY 2004 and FFY 2005.

	Name	Represents	Full-Time Government	Youth Member	Date of Appointment	Residence
1	*Robert Mardis, Chair	C, E			June 1995	Terre Haute
2	*Susan Carpenter	A	X		June 1995	Indianapolis
3	David Donahue	A	X		2005	Indianapolis
4	Jane Seigel	B	X		2005	Indianapolis
5	Robert Bingham	B	X		December 2006	Indianapolis
6	Judge Steve David	B			December 2006	Lebanon
7	Dr. Roger Jarjoura	C, D			December 2006	Indianapolis
8	Daimen Bathea	E			December 2006	Elkhart
9	John Wanner	D			December 2006	Berne
10	Rev. Martha Granger	D			December 2006	Evansville
11	Sheriff Stephen Luce	B			December 2006	Vincennes
12	Joe Garrero	D			December 2006	Goshen
13	Connie Keith	D			December 2006	Greenville
14	Mary Wellnitz	D			December 2006	LaPorte
15	Terry Modesitt	A, B			December 2006	Terre Haute
16	Aaron Negangard	B			December 2006	Lawrenceburg
17	Rebecca Humphrey	D			December 2006	Tippecanoe
18	Chanelle Vavasseur			X	May 2007	New Albany

The SAG serves as the advisory board.

Staff of the JJDP Formula Grants Program

The following list of people serves as staff for the Youth Division of the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI). Planning and Administration funds received from the Formula Grant Award and matched by the State are used to support these positions for the individual percentages of time listed:

EMPLOYEE	% OF TIME	POSITION
Michael Cunegin	10%	Executive Director
Tanya Johnson	100%	Division Director/JJ Specialist
Mary Murdock	20%	Chief Operations Officer
TBD	20%	Program Coordinator/EUDL
Devina Jani	100%	DMC Coordinator
Josh Ross	20%	Research Staff
William Lantz	10%	Fiscal Division Director
Brenda Copass-Israelis	05%	Fiscal Officer
Allison Webb	10%	Human Resources Administrator
Pauline Pollard	05%	Administrative Assistant

PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY THE YOUTH DIVISION

The Youth Division of ICJI administers all funds received by the State from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), including the following:

- Title II Formula Grants Program;
- Title V: Community Prevention Grants Program;
- Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG) Program; and
- Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws (EUDL) Program.

In addition to federal funds from OJJDP, the Division receives NHTSI federal Traffic Safety Funds through the Traffic Safety Division implement the Indiana Point of Youth (POY) program. These funds, in conjunction with a portion of EUDL funding, finance this statewide youth advocacy program that works to develop youth leaders from around the state to support local and statewide efforts in making Indiana communities safer.

The Youth Division administers one state-funded grant program as well. The Governor's Safe Haven Education Program is a \$2 million state funded grant program that provides funds for public school corporations and communities to jointly develop plans for opening school buildings for extended hours to implement programs that reduce substance abuse, reduce violent behavior, and/or

promote educational progress. Funds are also available to improve the safety and security of school facilities. The coordinator for this program is funded solely through state funds.

DESCRIPTION OF JJ SPECIALIST & OTHER DIVISION STAFF DUTIES

The Youth Division Director serves as the State's JJ Specialist and is responsible for direct oversight of all federal funds received from OJJDP, including the Title II Formula Grant, Title V: Community Prevention Grant, EUDL and Juvenile Accountability Block Grant funds. This includes:

- development of state plans/federal grant applications to be submitted to OJJDP;
- development of request for proposals and grant application materials to be distributed to potential applicants across the State;
- administrative review of grant proposals and grant applications and preparation of grant review materials for review by the Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group (JJSAG) and ICJI Board of Trustees;
- staffing of the JJSAG and ICJI Board of Trustees;
- administration and oversight of all subgrants awarded under the grant programs listed above, including direct supervision of one full-time program assistant to aid in grant administration;
- oversight of the State's Compliance Monitoring Program, including supervision of a full-time contract staff Compliance Monitor and coordination of part-time contract staff to implement statewide training and technical assistance for compliance monitoring;
- supervision of one full-time staff person responsible for oversight of the EUDL program and the POY program described above;
- supervision of one full-time staff person responsible for addressing DMC;
- supervision of one full-time staff person responsible for oversight of the Governor's Safe Haven Education Program described above; and
- responsible for state-level planning and policy development for juvenile justice issues, including serving as staff to the Governor's Juvenile Law Commission.

The Youth Division Program Assistant is responsible for the administration of programmatic paperwork for the grant programs listed above, including:

- preparation of subgrant award packets and grant files, including electronic financial histories;
- the receipt subgrant reports (both fiscal and programmatic) and entering of data into subgrant financial histories;
- direct contact with subgrants regarding reporting issues, questions, and delinquent reports;
- support staff for completion of federal reporting requirements, including compliance monitoring data entry; and
- other duties as assigned to aid in the administration of OJJDP grant programs.

The Youth Division Program Coordinator is responsible for administering the EUDL program and the POY program described above and provides further administrative support for the Formula Grant program as necessary.

The Youth Division provides a subgrant to the Youth Law TEAM of Indiana to provide the Institute with the services of one full-time Compliance Monitor who is responsible for the following:

- receipt, coding and entry of self-reported intake data from secure juvenile and adult facilities;
- administration of compliance monitoring records and facility files;
- conducting scheduled and random on-site compliance monitoring visits to both secure and non-secure juvenile and adult facilities to verify self reported data, determine sight/sound separation, verify non-secure status and determine technical assistance/training needs;
- address potential violations reported to ICJI by making telephone contact within 48 hours and if necessary conducted an on-site visit to coordinate a corrective action plan with the facility director;
- coordinating with the ICJI Research Division staff to analyze compliance monitoring data and annually submit the State's Compliance Monitoring Report to OJJDP; and
- develop a policy and procedure manual for the ICJI Compliance Monitoring Program.